

R E M A R K S

By the foregoing amendment, typographical errors appearing in the specification have been corrected as well as the informality appearing in claim 11. In addition, the form of claims 5 and 7 has been altered in a nonsubstantive way to overcome the Examiner's objections to their being in an allegedly improper "Jepson" type form. Further, the word "means" has been deleted from the Abstract.

Turning to the Office Action, it is believed that the cancellation of the term "means" places the Abstract in the proper form and notification to that effect is solicited.

The amendment to claim 11 is believed to obviate the objection to claims 11 and 12. That amendment follows exactly the form suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is believed to be acceptable.

The rejection of claim 5 has being an improper Jepson claim is not believed applicable. This is not a Jepson claim to begin with. It is a combination claim directed to the elements that make up the Applicant's inventive extrusion die head. The language preceding the phrase "the combination of" is a statement of the environment in which the extrusion die head is to be used and is not part of the claimed combination as would be the case if the claim were a Jepson claim.

While the Examiner may view such language as purely functional, it is to be noted that the courts have held numerous times that functional language in a claim is not, per se, improper and may, in fact, make what is actually the claimed subject matter more understandable. It is submitted that such is the case here. The

statement at the beginning of the claim is simply the environment in which the claimed extrusion die head is preferably used and there is nothing improper about that. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 and claims 6-8 directly or indirectly dependent thereon is in order.

As far as claim 9 is concerned, this is a Jepson claim and Applicant has adopted the Examiner's kind suggestion for overcoming the rejection. It is therefore believed that claim 9 is now allowable.

Respecting the rejection of claims 13 and 14, the previous amendments are believed to avoid any difficulty. Specifically, the changing of the phrase "the face" to --a face-- provides a term that does not require any antecedent.

Regarding the phrase directed to the corresponding end, the Examiner's kind suggestion has been adopted and it is believed that claims 13 and 14 are now free from any alleged indefiniteness.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the application is in allowable form and notification to that effect is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER

By:


Wm. A. Van Santen
Reg. No. 22,810

April 22, 2004

500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661-2511
(312/876-1800)